

Shabat Study February 12, 2021, by Yada

Please Note: I have transcribed this to the best of my ability. Sound bites of parties speaking simultaneously and those which were inaudible to me have been deleted from the transcript. If I guessed at a word, it was followed by ()? A _____ (blank line) indicates I could not understand the word or phrase and three periods ... indicate an interruption in the dialogue of one party by another. Thank you for your understanding. MK

Good evening. Welcome to Yada' Yah Radio. We're here with Kirk. How are you this evening, my friend? There are a couple things I want to do before we get to the Towrah. First, we are in the middle of the weirdest things I think I've experienced politically and that is the impeachment of someone who is not President. A friend said to me you want evidence, you talk about proof of fraud in the election, if you want proof that Trump must have won, the Democrats are trying to impeach him.

Nonetheless I did watch the 15-minute Democratic video and have some thoughts on it. First, to put together a video like that you are not a juror. So, this pretense that the Senate is sitting as jurors to decide the fate of a man who was president is utter nonsense. That video would not have passed muster in any courtroom under any circumstances. It is exceedingly unfairly edited. That said, Trump's rhetoric the day of the protest was inexcusable. He's just a dunderhead. What he said he encouraged people to walk down Pennsylvania Avenue and encouraged them to impose their will on Congress. He said that Pence ought to man up and do what he wanted him to do. He talked about fight like hell and all that sort of stuff.

What he said after having lost the election is unacceptable. He talked about the fact that he would have proof that he won by a landslide by the end of the day and of course he produced none. The media has said there's absolutely no proof of election fraud. That is the monolithic speech of the liberal media. They repeat things so often that are untrue that it comes across where people actually believe they are true. There is considerable evidence of election fraud, it's just not near to the scale that would be required for Trump to have won. And the biggest issue of all, of course, are those mail-in ballots and the lack of controls over said ballots and therefore the opportunity to cheat was enormous. Politicians, particularly liberal politicians, are very Machiavellian and knowingly cheat, so it is likely that there was considerable fraud, but the way that we deal with ballots in this country is that we hide the evidence. We do something that in the civilian sector would put you in jail, we destroy the evidence. If you destroy evidence, that's a felony in any place other than the US government actions. What Trump did I think was unconscionable. Now, the Democrats show in 15 minutes a video that none of us saw. The eight to ten hours I watched this, we were watching something that's never happened before. It was truly an amazing thing. My reaction was these guys are absolute nincompoops doing themselves enormous harm by their actions, and that the overwhelming preponderance of them were old, fat, and an armed with nothing but cell phones taking selfies to commemorate their trip to Washington. And that was the preponderance of the eight to ten hours that I watched. There is, of course, none of that video in 18 minutes, and context is King, if you want to understand what happens. Instead, this video that none of us saw that day, and they're trying to hold Trump accountable as he would have his speech to video that none of us had access to which, and I've always said this in every one of our shows,

those who actually reached inside, broke through windows and went into the US Capitol with their flag poles beating up on anybody that was in their way, what they did is a crime. They should be punished to the full extent of the law. That's not only breaking and entering it is also assault and battery. Those are crimes and those crimes can be felonies depending on the severity of them. What they did was completely wrong.

I will continue to say that the average protest whether it be in Washington or any great city, but of course in Minneapolis, Portland, and Seattle, but in most major cities when Black Lives Matter, in fact in Los Angeles when they were protesting there was far more violence against innocent bystanders, far more violence, far more destruction of property, looting and arson, and it went on for day after day after day. This was a matter of hours and there was essentially no looting or arson. And for the Democrats to make this sound like this is another 9/11 in this catastrophic event, when you compare it to the upheaval of Black Lives Matter its just utter nonsense. It says that people are unable to evaluate anything ... the truth is that while they're both nincompoops there's a little more credibility on the side of the Trumpite protesters than there is on Black Lives Matter. It seems the Trumpite protesters took their protest to the people that they have a grievance with as opposed to Black Lives Matter where they are their looting and stealing from people and burning buildings down of people they have no grievance with.

That said, one of the things that is deeply troubling to me about this whole process is the way the media and America went on a witch hunt where it is essentially unacceptable to express a conservative viewpoint, and no matter what you say as a liberal that is always acceptable.

A marvelous example happened this week. Disney has a program called the Mandalorian. It's a television variation of Star Wars. The bounty hunter, the Mandalorian cat character and a baby Yoda. There's a fellow named Pedro Pascal. Pedro Pascal plays the Mandalorian cat character. He's an over-the-top crazy liberal. There's a woman, Gina Carano, who plays a quasi-love interest of the Mandalorian. Gina Carano was fired by Disney and Pablo Pascal is continuing to be employed. Now they both had social media postings that were inappropriate. Carano's was that she spoke out in favor of Trump and made some claims that weren't true, but she wasn't an anti-Semite, she didn't incite violence, she just showed her political support for Trump, and when you do that you move often into the realm of conspiracy. I looked at her post and on a 1 to 10 scale of a nincompoop, and she's probably a 2. She's a conservative nincompoop working for an exceedingly liberal organization, Disney.

Pablo Pascal, who is the over-the-top liberal, took pictures of the mythical Palestinians which he claimed was a Jewish concentration camp during World War II and equated America trying to have some control over its borders with being like the Nazis. Now the Nazis put people in concentration camps for no reason whatsoever, worked them to death or killed them. America is simply trying to keep people out of their country as opposed to locking people up in jail. What this guy said was so utterly stupid, so utterly wrong and Disney doesn't even (discipline him)?

And there yet ... by the conservative. This tells you just how far we've gone off the deep end of the ...

KIRK: Well, what were these Jews in Israel supposed to do during World War II when they were all locked up in Germany? There was no Israel in World War Two.

YADA: He got his picture wrong and what he said is the opposite of what is true. ... because he compared America to Nazi Germany, which is moronic, he is he's exonerated and nobody even cares at Disney. And this woman, because she speaks favorably of Trump, is fired.

We don't have free speech in America ... to prevail over this but we'll see what transpires. I know one thing, the Mandalorian Show which cost them 11.5 million dollars an episode, I will never watch it and probably never again anything from Disney, I'm so disgusted by them.

All right with that said let's turn to the text we were just getting into. It would be considered the penalty phase, it really isn't a penalty, but it's God's reaction to the ... consequences of what they had done. He said you can eat from any tree that you want, it's all good, but if you eat from this tree, you're going to embody what it means to die. We know what 'Adam said when God said what did you do and 'Adam said hey, it's that woman that you gave to me. She's the one that told me to eat, and I ate. He didn't so much blame the woman as he blamed God. That 'Adam is ... That was really stupid.

“Then (wa) Yahowah (YaHoWaH – an accurate presentation of the name of 'elowah – God as guided by His towrah – instructions regarding His hayah – existence), who is God ('elohym – Almighty), said ('amar – expressed in words with unfolding consequences over time (qal imperfect)) to the woman (la ha ishah – concerning the female individual), 'Why (mah – as an interrogative implying what, when, where, or how) did you do this ('asah zo 'th – did you act this way at this moment in time (qal perfect))?”

A perfectly good question, right? Why did you do this? Do you think God's going to ask that question if He didn't want us not only to know her answer but to consider the implications of it? We would we be foolish not to consider the implications.

And the woman said (wa 'amar ha 'ishah – the female individual responded with ongoing implications (qal imperfect)), 'The tempting and toxic creature (wa ha nachash – the sorcerous snake, this venomous viper, the spellbinding serpent; from nachash – the one who enchants and captivates regarding the Divine, the one who practices divination, magic, and sorcery, who indulges in prophecy to capitalize by fortunetelling, invoking supernatural knowledge and power) deceived and deluded me (nasha' 'any – caused me to depart from the correct path by craftiness and trickery, giving me false hope, placing me in his debt by beguiling me (hifil perfect – the serpent influenced the woman making the woman his errant and misleading understudy at this moment)) and (wa – when) I ate (wa 'akal – so then I consumed).” (Bare'syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:13)

What is the difference between what ha Satan did and what Paul did?

KIRK: Exactly the same. He twisted what God Said using his credibility.

YADA: He deceived and deluded, caused people to depart from the correct path by craftiness and trickery giving people false hope that they're going to find their loved ones in heaven. Let me just be perfectly clear. There has never been and there will never be a single Christian in heaven. Not one, not ever. So, if your loved one died a Christian they are not in heaven. If your loved one died an Orthodox Jew, they are not in heaven. If your loved one who died as a secular, agnostic, atheist, or socialist, they are not in heaven. If your loved one died as a Muslim, they are not in heaven. We can say that with absolute certainty because there is a prerequisite for being part of Yahowah's Covenant family and it is only Covenant members that are allowed into God's home. That prerequisite is that you walk away from societal religious and political influences. So, anyone who continues to be religious is not invited into heaven. Now that does not mean that you cannot enter heaven having been a Christian. You and I were a Christians; we were not part of the Covenant. We came to recognize that Christianity was a pile of lies and we renounced it, walked away from it, disassociated ourselves from it, and we are no longer deceive or deluded by Paul or by the Christian New Testament. One of the things by the way that I learned is and I think I shared this on a program not too long ago was that with the exception of the book of Ya'aqob the couple of letters that are ascribed to Shim'on Kphas | Peter, the Revelation which is basically a rehash of prophetic books in the Towrah and Prophets. With the exception of the two books that John wrote (Neither John's letters, Peter's letters, or Ya'aqob's letters are well attested to and we don't know who wrote them), one of the things we do know is that Yahowchanan is very poorly maintained. There are enormous parts of it that were comprised centuries later. Luke was Paul's attache'. Mark was somebody that Paul specifically said that this guy is really useful to my ministry. I need him sent to me and then he would tell people that if you can find him that you need to deal with him in the way that I've instructed and then you need to send them to me, and Mark had the basis of both Luke and Matthew. So, I think of Matthew's words maybe 98% are found in Matthew. Matthew is about 60% based upon Mark and about 20 plus percent on Luke and the other part of it is plagiarized from an account that was written in Hebrew by the disciple Levy?/lowey? So Paul is the author of really the entirety of it other than what's the Book of John ... Revelation. Otherwise the Christian New Testament is Paul, and Paul was ... total and complete scum. So, ... go ahead.

KIRK: I was just going to say I was going through my stack of books this week and I found this old book I had on Paul and I scanned through it and that's what the guy says. He says without Paul there's no Christianity and he tried to defend him.

YADA: Christianity is all Paul. In fact, even the name Christianity and the ... name Christ are in some of Paul's letters and what you see beyond Paul's letters in the four books with the exception of Yahowchanan, they are all Paul's pals. Christianity is Paul, nothing more nothing less.

As I'm translating now again Chabaquwq One, it's stunning what God had to say about him that is so much more inviting when I really get into the roots of the words that he chose. It's just riveting.

Chawah, who's nameless at this point, did not accept responsibility either. And clearly, she was complicit. She not only misquoted God, she wanted to become like God. She clearly wanted to become like God. Unlike man, she surveyed the situation, thought about it, and made a conscious decision. Then she passed her lapse in judgment onto 'Adam.

What she did not do was compare what Satan had said to what Yahowah had instructed. And that's the key. If you don't do that, you're going to be easily deceived. She did not do that. And then, knowing that she had made a horrible mistake, she brought man down with her. She became what the Adversary had projected. He made a terrible mistake and then he brought mankind down with him.

This precipitous decline from good to bad occurred because of “*nasha*’ – delusional and beguiling deceptions.” Culture, like civilization, is something we are conditioned into embracing as good, uplifting. Boy, if you say cultured it’s uplifting and enlightening ... Rome and oh, it's the grand ... No. These civilizations were disgusting. They were horrible. They were vicious and oppressive, deceitful, enslaving. You think that people with Black Lives Matter have an issue today? Can you imagine being a minority under the Roman Empire?

Black Lives Matter are a perfect example of being deceived. They claim that the culture is racist, that whites are suppressing and killing blacks, and yet the opposite is true. The problem is in the African American culture is that they are killing themselves and it’s horrific. The facts are that young black men, lacking proper guidance, are eight times, 900%, more criminally violent than others, and when a black person is killed, 93% of the time the perpetrator is also black proves the point. It is irrefutable. Rather than blaming others for their mistakes, as ‘Adam and Chawah had done and learning something in the process, the only viable solution is to accept responsibility and then strive to improve. When we try to solve liberal-caused problems with more liberalism we are never going to improve because they aren’t able to accept responsibility.

Indeed, the American south was racist and oppressive seventy years ago, but that is no longer so, and more importantly affirmative action and the transfer of trillions of dollars from whites to blacks has created tremendous opportunities for African Americans. Moreover, what happened in a minority of American states six generations ago is not responsible for what is occurring today. In reality, with all of its failings, America has become the least racist, most universally opportunistic nation for minorities, in the history of humankind. So why are African Americans blaming others for what they have done to themselves, and worse, why do they blame others when they ought to be trying to capitalize on the opportunity that they have been given. And why do so many others concur with them? If you genuinely care about prolonging life, then why aren’t you trying to resolve the problems in the African American culture which are robbing far too many blacks of their lives?

I live on an island in the Caribbean Sea, and in this island, there is a fair amount of black-on-black crime. Very seldom does a Crucian, a black man, kill a white person. Most all the crime is related to one or two things. You either didn't pay your drug dealer, you're a rival drug dealer, or you are alleged to have taken somebody's woman. Can't be their wife because most don't marry. They just took somebody's woman, and they solve it that way. And because the community shelters their own and they don't hold them accountable the murder rate here is seven times greater than in the Continental U S. You might say why would you choose to live in a place where the murder rate is seven times greater? Well because I don't do drugs, I'm delighted with my wife, and I have no interest in somebody else's woman. So that puts me out of harm’s way in terms of the problems. But nonetheless, it's a very serious problem, and in this culture, there isn't a single Caucasian

politician. Not one. There's no conservative politician. Not one. There's no conservative judge, no conservative prosecutor, no Caucasian judge, or no Caucasian prosecutor every ...

KIRK: No opportunity to be one.

YADA: Oh, none, zero. So, how can you blame in the Continental U S whites for your problem when I live in a community, that's 2/3 ... and they're racist. There's no chance that a Caucasian or conservative is going to be elected, none. And yet the crime rate and murder rate is much higher than it is any place else. There's even the problem because of the welfare nature of the US, food stamps, unemployment benefits, and everything else, it's almost impossible to get a Crucian (to work)? There's lots of blacks here that are exceedingly quality individuals who work hard and there are 20 – 25 people here a day. Most are blacks. One of our guys today had a bad week so we sat down and had chocolate cake and ice cream together just to give him a break. We have a wonderful relationship. They all come from different Islands where there isn't that support mechanism of the liberal society. If you don't work, you don't eat. There's an entirely different ethic and ethnos that goes along with that and what we have done with this liberal society is we have taken people's character away so they no longer think it's important to work. And that's important here as we continue to study Yah's response because what He's going to say is the remedy ... to the problem is you need to go to work.

And so if God is saying the remedy to the fall of and the mistakes that were made by 'Adam and Chawah was you need to go to work that's not the penalty, it's the solution. If you're not working and not trying to work, shame on you. Now I must be careful here. There are people who are physically ... if you're if you're physically disabled then society should take care of you. Even if society takes care of them, it's still that most people would prefer to be whole. So, we're talking about people who are physically able which are in the 99% of those who are on government subsidies; they just choose not to work.

Biden wants to forgive all student loans. You talk about destroying the not only the value of the currency and the economy but also a sense of fairness. Why would somebody, like a good buddy who passed that article to me, work his tail off doing several jobs while going to college. I worked through college. Why ...that didn't take out loans, what are you going to do? Do we essentially get punished and you reward those who took out the loans who didn't work? There's something exceedingly wrong about that. If you borrow money and don't pay it back, that's a crime. Even if the government tells you we're going to legitimize it.

The truth is that the problem has nothing to do with ethnicity and all to do with culture. That is why Yahowah said that He wanted Abram not just to walk away from Babel confusing intermixing of religion and politics in Babylon, but he wanted him to disassociate from the culture of the community that he came from. Culture is very corrupting. The cult of man is the reason for the fall of Man. We just saw it manifest in these two peoples' lives. It's the essence of conspiracies. Somebody else is always responsible for somebody else's voice.

Retaining our focus on *nasha'* (נָשָׂא), spelled identically in the Hebrew text as *nasa'*, it is the operative word in the Third Instruction Yahowah etched in stone where Yahowah said I will not forgive anybody who promotes or accepts, lifts up, or endures the corruption and negation of My

name. It could also be *nasha'*. And hopefully it is *nasha'* because you would hope that the unforgivable sin isn't simply accepting and tolerating the grievous act of negating the merits of Yahowah's name by calling Him the Lord but instead engaging in some form of deception and deliberate corruption. And so if it's *nasha'*, if that's what God actually meant to say in the Third Statement that He etched in stone, then it would be that the unforgettable sin is doing something deliberately deceitful to negate the value of Yahowah's name by replacing Yahowah with the Lord; that would be a good example.

If Yahowah intended *nasa'*, rather than *nasha'*, then simply concurring with the removal of Yahowah's name from His Towrah would be unforgivable. And yet if Yahowah intended for us to read *nasha'*, then it is deliberate deception, delusions which take others away from God, which becomes the unresolvable crime. The reason I say that they are written the same in the Hebrew text is the sin vs the shin. In the diacritical marking today a dot is put over the right side as a shin and the left side as a sin. So, there's a huge difference in these two words particularly as we look at the Third Statement that God etched on the stone tablets. So, there is every reason to conclude that we will find 'Adam and Chawah in Shamaym. God loves them. More importantly, Yahowah's *towrah* | guidance does not exist to condemn us, but instead to exonerate us. Yahowah wants to lift us up, not push us down, which would be *nasha'*. His seven *Migra'ey* | Invitations to Meet lead to our emancipation and salvation. The Covenant is a family, not a courtroom.

There is another religious misconception we ought to correct. There is only one sin that is universally deadly from a spiritual perspective. And therefore Catholicism's "seven deadly sins", some are really hilarious, one of those being a couch potato. I don't know what the word is.

KIRK: Sloth.

YADA: Yeah. Let me tell you, everything that you could do to deserve She'owl | Hell, you all as Catholics have done it and being a sloth is not one of them. In fact a sloth would be specifically excluded from hell because a sloth isn't doing anything to miss ...

All right, let's just have a quick review before you move on to Yahowah's response to all these. This is Genesis | *Bare'syth* 2:15 to the conclusion.

“Yahowah, Almighty, relationally selected and grasped hold of the man named ‘Adam and He settled him in the Garden of ‘Eden to minister to her and to closely observe her, closely examining and carefully considering it. (*Bare'syth* / Genesis 2:15)

Work. Yahowah obviously thinks work is good because He put 'Adam in the Garden to serve in the Garden to minister her and to closely exam and carefully consider. Even to be observant is work but from God's perspective (and mine) it's delightful. Work has become a pejorative, but it isn't. My wife constantly kids me and says, you know, you just really need to slow down sometimes, just do nothing occasionally. I'm always going. I am the Eveready Bunny. I got up this morning at 5:30 and I came right in here and started translating Chabaquwq. Then my crews came in and I was orchestrating what we're doing, and you just go until your conk out at the end of the day and fall asleep, right? I like work. I've always liked work. I don't know what people have against work. Anyway, the Garden of Eden. 'Adam was brought into the Garden to work.

Then Yahowah, Almighty, provided direction concerning and on behalf of ‘Adam, the man, saying, ‘From every tree of the Garden you can continually and actually eat, enthusiastically being fed and nurtured. (2:16)

Therefore could there have been a forbidden fruit? He’s really clear.

‘From every tree of the Garden you can continually and actually eat, enthusiastically being fed and nurtured. (2:16)

But from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good, that which is

By the way, there is no Hebrew word for but. It’s simply “and” | wa new sentence.

From the Tree of the Knowledge of Good, that which is beneficial and productive, correct and proper, favorable and enjoyable, desirable and agreeable, moral and right, valuable and worthy, even beautiful, generous, pleasing, pleasant, festive, and joyful, and Bad,

ra’ – is the counterpart of good. I don’t know why they call it good and evil because the counterpart of good is bad. You can add evil to the list of words, but they should be counterparts because that’s what it is. So if *towb* is effective than *ra’* is ineffective. One is productive, the other counterproductive. If one is correct, the other is errant. If one is proper, the other is improper.

that which is ineffective and counterproductive, errant and improper, disadvantageous and undesirable, disagreeable and immoral, both wrong and worthless, restrictive, displeasing, harmful, malignant, depraved, and saddening, do not make a habit of continuing to eat from it.

Therefore is written in the perfect.

KIRK: Do not make a habit. It does not mean you couldn’t eat one.

YADA: That is correct. You and I we were both Christians, the plague of death.

KIRK: Yeah, we ate a little bit of fruit.

YADA: Yeah, we did but we don’t anymore, so the moment you stop you’re no longer ... instruction. So ... if ‘Adam had walked in and saw Chawah ... just set the thing down, toss it away, it’s a really bad idea. Yahowah has been really good to us. This is what He said. If we do this, there’s going to be a negative consequence. Just set it down and it’ll all be cool. In fact, let’s call God over and talk to Him about it. The instruction was don’t make a habit and we’ll be fine. But of course, that’s not what happened.

All right, so don’t make a habit of eating from it because as a consequence, not as a penalty,

Because as a consequence, within a day you will absolutely die defined by having eaten from it, coming to resemble what you have consumed.’ (2:17)

The day here is very likely a thousand years to establish six days plus the seventh of creation and the timeline ongoing because ‘Adam was right close to a thousand years old particularly considering his time in ‘Eden when he passed away. And it goes up close to the time of the Flood.

What it basically says is you're going to die, and he began to die that very moment. He was immortal, he was no longer immortal. So, instruction is over. There you go. You've got a choice with a consequence. Instructions over.

Yahowah, Almighty, said, 'It is not good, productive or beneficial for the man, 'Adam, representing mankind created in God's image, to exist alone or be by himself. I will engage and continually act on his behalf, producing a helper and supporter, one who assists and serves, a positive influence who rescues and renews like his corresponding counterpart, describing that which is straightforward, right for him, open to him, close by in his immediate proximity.' (2:18)

We are social creatures. We do not do well alone. I don't like being alone. I'm much more productive and happiest and more fulfilled surrounded by people.

So then Yahowah, Almighty, who fashioned and formed out of the elements of the earth every living animal of the expansive environment

Which would be the area outside the Garden

in addition to every bird in the sky, brought them to 'Adam in order to witness and delight in what he would call them and how he would greet and welcome them, even if he would summon them and invite them to meet with him, approaching them.

God created this beautiful universe in the Garden and outside and God's idea of fulfilling man's being, making man content, happy, and satisfied was to explore life with ___. No matter how beautiful a rainbow may be, a waterfall, a sunrise or sunset, water glistening on the waves, tropical beaches, a jagged mountain ridge, no matter how beautiful those things may be, life is far more compelling for the living. That's why I think that God created life out of DNA and that we will one day be able to write that code, conceive life, and enjoy that whole aspect of conceiving and nurturing, enjoying life. It's going to be just enormously spectacular.

Therefore, for the benefit of the relationship and to reveal the proper path to walk to get the most out of life, (asher) everything 'Adam approached, welcomed, and encountered, designating by name, that became the depiction and reputation of that living soul and conscious lifeform. (2:19)

'Adam summoned and met with, greeting by name and proper designation all of the animals, the birds of the sky, and every conscious lifeform of the expansive environment.

Which would have meant the men that he encountered humans, male and female but they wouldn't have a neshamah.

But there was not found for 'Adam a helper and supporter, one who could assist and serve alongside similar to or right for him. (2:20)

So God tried. He I think he probably thought that it was likely that He would find something in all those life forms. We don't know what kind of dogs existed at the time, but goodness dogs have become spectacular. A dog can communicate with you, you can communicate with it and they're

far better at understanding our commands than we are at understanding theirs, that's for darn sure. So who's the smarter one, right? I can tell you my dog speaks two languages. She is quite conversant in French. She will do any command that you asked of her in French and in English. And I can't speak French worth a left, and I'm quite convinced that all of the sounds that she makes I'm not able to decipher them. I would have thought that 'Adam would have liked dogs. The aardvark may be a different story. But why did he like dogs?

But there was not found for 'Adam a helper and supporter, one who could assist and serve alongside similar to or right for him. (2:20)

As a result, Yahowah, Almighty, caused the man, 'Adam, to be anesthetized, falling deeply asleep, similar to being under anesthesia. And while he slept, He grasped hold of one of his ribs from his side and sutured up the place beneath it, replacing it with living tissue. (2:21)

Then Yahowah, Almighty, constructed with the rib, building for the purpose of the family and for procreation, establishing also for restoration that which to reveal the benefits of the relationship He had taken from the man, 'Adam, a woman for a wife. And He brought her to the man." (2:22)

Then 'Adam responded, 'This is the way to conduct one's life,

This reminds me of a book you might read written in the seventeenth century that was written by someone of equal stature in the 21st century. 'Adam's response is more like the 17th century. Its long-winded sentences are a paragraph long, a paragraph can be a page. Today if you write a long sentence, you've lost people about five words into it. And if you have a paragraph that is a page long, then you don't have any readers.

Then 'Adam responded, 'This is the way to conduct one's life, the motivation to push forward and the persistent heartbeat of life, its essential nature out of my essence, a living being able to communicate intelligently for me to desire and to share positive thoughts. For this reason, she shall be greeted, welcomed, and called, "woman," because out of man she was taken. (2:23)

The "in sickness and health, for better or worse till death do you part" has nothing to do with what God ever said. And the exclusion of all others again has nothing to do with God. Nothing. Man imposed that. Why don't we say,

'This is the way to conduct one's life, the motivation to push forward and the persistent heartbeat of life, its essential nature out of my essence, a living being able to communicate intelligently for me to desire and to share positive thoughts. For this reason, she shall be greeted, welcomed, and called, "woman," because out of man she was taken. (2:23)

That would make a much better __, don't you think?

Accordingly, therefore, a man shall leave his

This line seems so awkward. I'm going to finish it. But it seems that ...

KIRK: I know where you're going.

YADA: Yeah, it just doesn't fit. There's been no lecturer here at all. At this point there's only one father and that's Yahowah. The only mother would be the Set-apart Spirit early on in creation and you certainly don't leave Them to be with your spouse. It's true that to be part of the Covenant you leave your father's house, but that's really ... so this is really awkward line here. It's so early in *Bare'syth* that there's just no good way to check into the Qumran Scrolls ... right, because the beginning of a scroll is the hardest part in terms of its survival. The part that is most tightly wound on the inside is the part that was exposed to the elements on the outside the parts that decay so we, so we don't have this in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Accordingly, therefore, a man shall leave his father and his mother and engage, becoming close with his woman. And they shall exist as a unified pronouncement regarding life and an uplifting declaration concerning living in the flesh. (2:24)

There are a lot of insights that would have been appropriate but it's too early in the story here. And what are we to make of that other than men and women as mother and father who come together to conceive and raise children, that is not where we are in the story. That whole process is exceedingly symbolic of the Covenant and very insightful in terms of what God is offering us and what He's expecting in return.

And the two, the man and his woman, were naked, and they were not ashamed, wrong, or bothered by it.” (*Bare'syth* / Genesis 2:25)

I can see God saying this because man has been wont to imply all sorts of rules on sexuality and God does not have a hang-up with human sexuality. (He celebrates it)? The curbs on human sexuality are extremely bad behavior. Don't have sex with somebody who does not have the ability to consent which is what we wrongly translated as lying with another man and homosexuality. No. When you examine the words as they are revealed in the Towrah, don't take advantage of a man sexually when he has no means to thwart the aggression. God says a lot about incest. He thinks incest is a huge breach of trust and exceedingly hostile to everyone. So all forms of incest from God's perspective are way outside the bounds of what's appropriate.

Pedophilia and rape are inappropriate from God's point of view. Womanizing in the sense of having more women than you can love, nurture, protect, and treat in an appropriate way, like ... having a large harem and you can't fulfill the needs. The needs are many. time together, romance, conversation, support. God says no, you can't have more than you can meaningfully make happy and satisfied. And lastly no bestiality. That's really work. Otherwise God doesn't care. So, I can see this line that says they were naked, and it's no big deal, it's just fine. Now, it would be tragic for God to have designed us to be aroused in one another's presence and then say I'm going to send you to hell if you are aroused in one another's presence.

I shared this with Leah, and you know, it's amazing the kind of wife I have because most women would just slap you silly because you say this, but the fact is that men are not naturally monogamous. We just aren't. It's our nature to not necessarily be monogamous. In my case, I'm so delighted with my situation I can't even conceive of wanting someone else. It's the way we men have always been wired. Men are not naturally monogamous. And sometimes women get a misconception of romance and the way things ought to be by establishing rules based upon

monogamy that probably aren't in anybody's best interest. Now, I am not advocating anything other than the fact is you study Yahowah's word, almost everyone that Yahowah worked with most had multiple wives. You never hear God say anything about Dowd was wrong; you don't hear Him saying anything about him committing adultery or anything of that nature or about having multiple wives. If he had stopped at seven, God would have happier than if he went to eight. Not that there's any difference between the numbers seven and eight, Bathsheba ... and the way he went about it was not good, and God told him, __ you need a little time out. What you did here is not good. ... You didn't need to that. So they were naked and not ashamed by it.

These are tough transitions. I mean we go point to point to point, and right now we're to the spellbinding serpent. So I guess they were not ashamed that they were naked. I would say that the way that most people are, now they're going to get their panites in a bunch if I may use that term, is that it's always something to do with sexuality in the religious point of view, promiscuity, and yet if nakedness was just fine, and the next line is and the serpent slithered into the garden, then sensuality was not the problem. So, that's an important point.

“The spellbinding serpent (*wa ha nachash*) was (*hayah*) cunning and clever (*'aruwm*), more so than (*min*) any other (*kol*) lifeform (*chayah*) relative to (*'asher*) the broad and open way (*sadeh*) that Yahowah (יהוה), Almighty (*'elohym*), had deployed (*'asah*

The fact that God says that he was clever, that he was subtle. This caused me a lot of problems as I was doing my most recent edit pass through questioning Paul because Paul is not clever, and he is not subtle. He's a blithering idiot. He deliberately misquotes God, he misappropriates what God says, he twisted everything in such a way that it takes five seconds to figure out that he's lying. He contradicts himself constantly, he says things that are just so unbelievably stupid that you could never mistake him for being clever. He is not the least bit subtle, he is just completely irrational. ... One of the things that struck me is that there is really not much of a rebuke of ha Satan in the Towrah and Prophets. It says here that ha Satan wanted to be perceived as above the Most High which, means he wants to worshiped as God. He wants to be known as God he wants to be worshiped as God. It's a very important insight because it means that the god of religion is actually Satan and that if you think that an occultist or Satan worshiper is worshiping Satan then you are a nincompoo. Satan despises that. So, he wants to be worshiped as God.

You are going to see that God has this one rebuke of the serpent here in the Garden and says here's your fate. But that's it. And yet with Paul He goes on and on and on and on. Chabaquwq 1, 2, & 3 are entirely devoted to Paul. In many of the Mizmowr the adversary in the Mizmowr is, everybody says oh Paul's constantly ____. No, he's attacking Sha'uwl / Paul. The Mashal, the parables /Proverbs, it's Dowd attacking Sha'uwl / Paul. He's listed throughout the prophets. So, God is constantly haranguing Paul and says almost nothing beyond this little bit that we're about to read on Satan. Paul is much more disgusting from God's point of view than is Satan. That's something to think about it.

KIRK: Could it be that He created him to fail so they would have an alternative where the disappointment is that man was not supposed to fail. He's disappointed in man. He wouldn't have

been disappointed in Satan. Satan was fulfilling a function that he was designed to do to be an adversary.

YADA: That's a valid point. But it's also a valid point that while Satan demon possessed Sha'uwl and he attempted to control him, I'm convinced that Satan lost control. I think Paul was worse and more belligerent and egotistical than Satan could handle. I think Satan was as disgusted by Paul as was Yahowah. I think Paul ... Satan, you're the one that I did all this for. You are such a disgusting egotistical idiot. What a blubbering idiot. I could have gotten the village idiot to do a better job than you.

So then the serpent said to the woman, **“So what if God said you should not make a habit of eating from any tree in the Garden.”**

That's the opposite of what God said. Being the opposite means that every word but one was correct. So it's amazing that you could have a sentence where every word in the sentence was accurate and one would be a negation | *lo'* is the only thing that is inaccurate, and it makes the sentence the antithesis of what God said. God did not say you should not make a habit of eating from any tree in the Garden. He said exactly the opposite; every tree in the Garden is there for you to eat. God's statement was the opposite of what Satan said, but because there were common threads withing the words it's easy for people to miss that.

“The woman (*wa 'ishah* – the female individual and wife) **said** (*'amar* – answered and replied) **to** (*'el*) **this tempting and toxic creature** (*wa ha nachash* – the sorcerous snake, this venomous viper, the spellbinding serpent; from *nachash* – the one who enchants and captivates regarding the Divine, the one who practices divination, magic, and sorcery, who indulges in prophecy to capitalize by fortunetelling, invoking supernatural knowledge and power), **‘From** (*min* – off of) **the fruit** (*pery* – that produced) **of the tree** (*'ets* – plant (singular)) **of the Garden** (*ha gan* – of the protected enclosure for living) **we can eat** (*'akal* – we can continually consume and be nourished (qal imperfect)). (3:2)

But (*wa* – and) **from the fruit** (*min pery*) **of the tree** (*ha 'ets*) **which is in the center** (*'asher ba ha tawek*) **of the Garden** (*ha gan*), **God** (*'elohym*) **said** (*'amar* – once clearly stated (qal perfect)), **‘You should not actually make a habit of eating from it** (*lo' 'akal min huw'* – you should not continually consume from it nor consistently be nourished by it (qal imperfect)).

That's true. God said that.

In addition (*wa* – and also), **you guys should not make contact with it** (*lo' naga' ba huw* – you (plural) should not habitually touch it, continually strike it, actually abuse it, or damage it (qal imperfect)) **lest** (*pen* – or otherwise) **you will have chosen to die** (*muwth* – you will be killed in time (qal imperfect paragogic nun – actually, on an ongoing basis, and of one's own volition)).” (*Bare'syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:3)

The last part was true, but the “don't touch it” is inaccurate.

“But (*wa* – then) **the venomous serpent** (*nachash* – this sorcerous snake, venomous viper, and spellbinding creature, the one who enchants and captivates regarding the Divine, the one who

practices divination, magic, and sorcery, and who indulges in prophecy by fortunetelling, invoking supernatural knowledge and power) **replied** (*'amar* – answered, saying) **to** (*'el*) **the woman** (*ha 'ishah*), **'You absolutely will not die** (*lo' muwth muwth* – you will not actually come to embody death, you will not be assassinated nor killed (qal infinitive – the negation of the genuine depiction of dying and qal imperfect – depicting actual death occurring over time)).” (*Bare'syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:4*)

So, Satan lied. False hope. You can do it and you are going to live forever. Trust me on this false hope.

“Because instead (*ky* – rather by contrast), **the Almighty** (*'elohym* – God) **knows** (*yada'* – is aware and recognizes, understands and must confess (qal participle – a verbal adjective genuinely depicting actual and demonstrable recognition)) **that truthfully** (*ky* – surely) **in** (*ba*) **the day** (*yowm*) **you eat** (*'akal 'atem* – you are fed and are nourished by consuming (qal infinitive)) **from it** (*min huw'*), **your eyes** (*wa 'ayn 'atem* – your perspective and ability to see) **will be opened** (*paqach* – will enable you to be sensible and understand, gaining discernment and insights (nifal perfect – by opening your eyes you will be enlightened for a time)).

Then you will exist (*wa hayah* – be) **like** (*ka* – similar to and comparable to) **God** (*'elohym*), **knowing** (*yada'* – recognizing, discerning, discriminating, distinguishing, experiencing, and acknowledging) **good** (*towb* – that which is beneficial, pleasing, enjoyable, correct, prosperous, and beautiful) **and bad** (*ra'* – that which is ineffective, counterproductive, harmful and distressing).” (*Bare'syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:5*)

Much of that is true. It's not what God said, it's extrapolating, it doesn't make it inaccurate. Yes, God knows that in the day that you eat from it your eyes will be opened. That's true. You will you know more than you know now. Knowing more than you know now is not necessarily good. I do not know what it's like to step in a lava flow or what it's like to get run over by a truck, or to be shot and in the gut with a gun. ... advantage of knowing those things. Then he said,

Then you will exist (*wa hayah* – be) **like** (*ka* – similar to and comparable to) **God** (*'elohym*), **knowing** (*yada'* – recognizing, discerning, discriminating, distinguishing, experiencing, and acknowledging) **good** (*towb* – that which is beneficial, pleasing, enjoyable, correct, prosperous, and beautiful) **and bad** (*ra'* – that which is ineffective, counterproductive, harmful and distressing).” (*Bare'syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:5*)

That part was true, but it was misleading at the same time. It's true that God knows good and bad. If God knows good and bad and you're going to know good and bad then you are more like God, right? But the inference was ... you're going to be God. You're going to be like God in one way and that one way isn't necessarily good. In fact, that one way has good and bad connotations to it.

The inference was, this is what's subtle; you're going to be like God, you're going to be like a god, you will become a god is the inference when in fact what he was saying was actually true - God knows good and evil and good and bad. If you eat from this, you're going to know good and bad so you can be like God in that respect. It would have been completely and totally honest if he had said the Almighty knows that in the day that you eat from it, your eyes will be opened and you

will know things that are bad and counterproductive in addition to things that you currently know that are good. I'm not sure there's any advantage of knowing bad but nonetheless you ... know it. ... knowing bad just like God knows bad, not that that's any good. ...

“Then (wa) the woman (‘ishah) looked and saw (ra’ah – she viewed and perceived) that indeed (ky – surely and truly, ready to make an exception) the tree (ma’akal) was beautiful and pleasing (towb – pleasant and beneficial, productive and good) as a source of food to consume (la ma’akal – for nourishment, to approach, process, and eat), and that indeed (ky – in addition, surely) it was visually appealing and desirable, even eliciting cravings (ta’awah huw’ la ha’ayn – it was perceived as a lustful longing to be satisfied, and was seen as a jealous inclination for the eyes).

Oh, she's having an emotional response. So, she coveted ... tree impart insights, inspire success, convey understanding. Oh am I gonna be impressive to ‘Adam. I'm going to know this stuff. I'm going to be so insightful. I'm going to be so successful. Give me some of that apple.

Therefore (wa), she grasped hold and seized (laqach – she obtained and accepted, she received, collected, and took with genuine intent and ongoing implications (qal imperfect)) from (min – part of) its fruit (pary huw’ – its produce and harvest, its result) and ate (wa’akal – consumed it (qal imperfect – literally and genuinely forming an ongoing relationship by continually eating).

I should have not said apple. We have no idea what the fruit was. The fruit was symbolic. There was nothing in the fruit that caused anything to change with Chawah at all. We don't eat something and it causes us to know things we don't currently know. Knowledge takes effort. It simply was nothing more than a choice with a consequence.

Then (wa), she also gave it (nathan gama’ – in addition and besides she continually offered it, finally and in turn she habitually provided it (qal imperfect)) to (la – approaching in the direction of, moving toward) her man (‘iysh hy’ – her masculine individual and by context, husband) who was in a relationship with her (‘im hy’ – who was associated with her and similar to her), and then he ate (wa’akal – he imbibed and consumed on an ongoing basis (qal imperfect)).”
(Bare’syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:6)

That was something that ‘Adam should not have done. Adam should have said now wait a minute. This is wrong; let’s talk about it. Put it down. Let's work this out with God.

“So (wa) the eyes, perceptions, and perspective (‘ayn - the sight) of both of them (shaneym hem – of the two of them) were opened (paqach – enabled to see and comprehend, processing the sensory perceptions) and they recognized (wa yada’ – so they realized, acknowledged, and knew, even understood (qal imperfect)) as a result (ky – by contrast that indeed) they were naked and exposed (‘eyrowm hem – they were without adequate clothing, unprotected and ashamed; from ‘aram – they had become crafty and shred).

Now, they had been together this whole time naked, and it didn't bother them in the least; it was good. Now they are naked and exposed and it’s bothersome therefore they're not talking about a lack of clothing. They are saying that when everything about them was positive and good and they were able to be seen and be in the presence of God when everything about them was good they were not uncomfortable. You don't feel exposed. But if you're doing something that you know is counterproductive that you ought not be doing,

that is embarrassing in front of a perfect God, then you're going to feel really vulnerable and exposed. So, they had done something they ought not have done, something that a loving father asked them not to do and so that is why they felt vulnerable. It had nothing to do with their physical appearance and their lack of apparel.

Then (*wa*) **they stitched together** (*taphar* – they sowed and mended together) **fig** (*ta'edah*) **foliage** ('*aleh* – branches and leaves), **acting to make for themselves** (*wa 'asah la hem* – engaging to create by themselves) **a covering** (*chagorah* – a garment or sash).” (*Bare'syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:7)

The story here is that with the fall there would be reconciliation or redemption. It is the fig tree and the foliage of the fig tree that is symbolic of Israel but ___ I am bearing fruit again so that Yahowah can honor His Covenant promises.

“And they heard (*wa shama'* – then they listened to) **the sound** ('*eth qowl*) **of Yahowah** (𐤏𐤃𐤅𐤃𐤁 – the pronunciation of *YaHoWaH* as guided by His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence), **Almighty** ('*elohym*), **walking** (*halak* – traveling (hitpa'el participle – depicting an extremely descriptive movement which is completely independent, neither acted upon nor influenced by anyone else)) **in** (*ba*) **the protected and enclosed Garden** (*ha gan* – the enclosure designed for life and living) **regarding** (*la* – concerned about and moving toward) **the spirit** (*ruwach*) **of the day** (*ha yowm*).

Therefore, the man, 'Adam (*wa ha 'adam*), **and his woman** ('*ishah huw'*) **withdrew and hid** (*chaba'* – the sought to protect themselves by retreating and moving away so as not to be discovered) **from** (*min*) **the presence** (*paneh* – the appearance and face) **of Yahowah** (*YaHoWaH* – an accurate presentation of the name of '*elowah* – God as guided by His *towrah* – instructions regarding His *hayah* – existence), **as Almighty God** ('*elohym*), **in the midst of** (*ba tawek* – in and among) **the Garden's** (*gan*) **trees** ('*ets*).” (*Bare'syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:8)

Therefore God has a corporeal nature. Sorry Akiba and Maimonides, you were wrong in your creation of Judaism. Christians, you are also wrong. God is not omnipresent or omniscient based upon this testimony.

“Yahowah (*Yahowah* – God's name transliterated as guided by His *towrah* – instructions on His *hayah* – existence and His role in our *shalowm* – reconciliation as '*elowah* – Almighty God), **who is God, Almighty** ('*elohym*), **called out to** (*qara' 'el* – invited and summoned (qal imperfect)) **the man, 'Adam** ('*adam*) **and He asked him** (*wa 'amar la huw'* – He spoke to him, questioning (qal imperfect)), **‘Where are you** ('*ey 'atah* – why, and for what purpose are you in this position)?” (*Bare'syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:9)

“He said (*wa 'amar* – so then he answered), **‘I heard** (*shama'* – I listened at this moment to (qal perfect)) **your sound** ('*eth 'atah qowl*) **in** (*ba*) **the Garden** (*ha gan* – the sheltered enclosure) **and because** (*wa ky* – so for the reason that) **I was naked and exposed** ('*eyrowm 'anoky* – I was without adequate clothing, unprotected and ashamed, improperly clothed), **out of reverence and respect, I was concerned** (*yare'* – distressed due to my recognition of your honorable nature and status, I was intimidated, perhaps even afraid) **and I withdrew having foreclosed something I cherished** (*chaba'* – I moved away and hid, I retreated so as not to be discovered because I had withdrawn from someone I cherished, having hindered the loving relationship; from *chabab* – to love and to be beloved, to care deeply and fervently).” (*Bare'syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:10)

He shut the door on this completely open, totally exposed and yet enjoyable, loving relationship. I've always thought that the more vulnerable you can be with someone you love than the deeper and more meaningful that relationship is. He spoiled that.

“He said (*wa ‘amar* – so He questioned), **‘Who** (*my* – asking a what, where, why, when, or how question) **approached and reported to you** (*nagad la ‘atah* – came before you and openly told and informed you, conveying the message to you) **that** (*ky*) **you were without adequate clothing, naked and exposed** (*‘eyrowm ‘atah* – you were unprotected, causing you to be ashamed as a result of being improperly clothed)?

Interesting question. Why is it that all of a sudden you think that your being naked is somehow wrong? He’s saying again that our nudity is not a problem. The problem is that when we do things that we should not have done we feel uncomfortable in God's presence.

Did (*ha* – an interrogative to show that a question is being asked in which a yes or no answer is possible) **you eat** (*‘akal*) **from** (*min*) **the tree** (*ha ‘ets*) **which, for the benefit of the relationship** (*‘asher* – to show the proper way to get the greatest benefit and the most enjoyment out of life) **I provided instructions for you** (*sawah la ‘atah* – I offered directions concerning you, verbally, albeit loudly and clearing, providing the message on your behalf) **not to be defined by eating** (*bilthy ‘akal* – to make an exception and disassociate from consuming that will actively and demonstrably consume you, eating away at you (qal infinitive – a verbal noun which establishes an actual relationship through ingestion)) **from it** (*min huw’*)?” (*Bare’syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:11*)

“Adam (*wa ha ‘adam* – so the man) **said** (*‘amar* – muttered), **‘The woman** (*ha ‘ishah*) **You gave** (*nathan* – You offered and presented) **to be with me** (*‘imad ‘any* – to associate in a relationship with me) **to make the relationship better** (*‘asher* – to show the way to receive the most enjoyable benefits), **she offered it** (*hy’ nathan* – she gave it) **to me** (*la ‘any* – approaching me with it) **from the tree** (*min ha ‘ets*), **so I ate** (*wa ‘akal* – then I consumed).” (*Bare’syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:12*)

Up to this point 99% of the mistake is on ‘Adam not Chawah. Yes, Chawah wanted to be like God. Yes, Chawah wanted something that she should not have wanted; she coveted. She had an emotional response and she misquoted God. But the fact is that Yahowah gave that instruction to ‘Adam and it was ‘Adam’s responsibility to share it with Chawah and to honor it himself and to man up not be a wussy. He didn't do it. So, ‘Adams far more culpable here than is Chawah.

“Then (*wa*) **Yahowah** (*YaHoWaH* – an accurate presentation of the name of *‘elowah* – God as guided by His *towrah* – instructions regarding His *hayah* – existence), **who is God** (*‘elohym* – Almighty), **said** (*‘amar* – expressed in words with unfolding consequences over time (qal imperfect)) **to the woman** (*la ha ishah* – concerning the female individual), **‘Why** (*mah* – as an interrogative implying what, when, where, or how) **did you do this** (*‘asah zo’th* – did you act this way at this moment in time (qal perfect))?”

And the woman said (*wa ‘amar ha ‘ishah* – the female individual responded with ongoing implications (qal imperfect)), **‘The tempting and toxic creature** (*wa ha nachash* – the sorcerous

snake, this venomous viper, the spellbinding serpent; from *nachash* – the one who enchants and captivates regarding the Divine, the one who practices divination, magic, and sorcery, who indulges in prophecy to capitalize by fortunetelling, invoking supernatural knowledge and power) **deceived and deluded me** (*nasha* ‘any – caused me to depart from the correct path by craftiness and trickery, giving me false hope, placing me in his debt by beguiling me (hifil perfect – the serpent influenced the woman making the woman his errand and misleading understudy at this moment)) **and** (*wa* – when) **I ate** (*wa* ‘*akal* – so then I consumed).’” (*Bare’syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:13)

The thing that is important there that we didn’t mention previously is that God allowed the Adversary into the Garden and He allowed the Adversary to corrupt His testimony. Therefore when Christians say I can’t believe that God would allow anyone to corrupt His word, it is inerrant word of God, then they are not reading what is actually written. God says explicitly that He allowed Satan in to do this very thing. Of course, it takes complete ignorance because there are as many variations of the text as there are copies of the text. So accepting responsibility is a simple, straightforward concept perplexing that 6000 years later less than one in a million are willing to stand up and be counted. Considering the example that Yahowah has set for us, it must be heartbreaking for Him to see us in this way.

I began this by saying when you look what the people did inside the US Capitol, that footage didn’t become available until fairly recently and is out of context with what transpired elsewhere. It’s bad. A lot of people acted in a wholly inappropriate way and committed criminal acts. And we ought to acknowledge that. And what Trump said was absolutely wrong. It doesn’t exonerate democrats for trying to impeach him now or calling this an insurrection because it isn’t. An insurrection has to go so far beyond to literally replacing a government, tearing down one and in a coup ... clearly these people didn’t come back to Washington saying we’re going to destroy the United States of America, we’re going to establish a new country, we’re going to declare ourselves the leader of this country, and once we sack the government, we’re not leaving. No.

Since Yahowah knew the answer to His questions, and since he queried ‘Adam and Chawah but not Satan, we can reasonably conclude that had either admitted to having been wrong and had asked for an opportunity to show that they would not repeat the same mistake, Yahowah would have obliged. He did not create us to judge us nor condemn us, but instead to raise us.

However, until we are willing to admit that we have been wrong and show a desire to improve, there is very little God can do for us. The same is true for any parent under any circumstance.

Now at this point we can go right into Chapter 5 is called *Mashal, Revealing Stories* about fragile families. We’ll talk about the specifics of Yahowah’s response to each of them. You said that you were reading *Chronicles*.

KIRK: What I’d like to do is get into this a little further and I’ll show you where it’s appropriate because I’m wanting to quote something from *Chronicles* ... comment so when we get close to it, I’ll let you know.

YADA: All right, that's fair enough. The bottom line here is for the choice to reject Yahowah to be credible, deceit and death must have an advocate. They are not very appealing, so since they better have someone that's an advocate for it. That is the reason Satan was permitted to enter the Garden. You were correct, Kirk, Satan was created for that reason. While the world is no longer 'Eden, the Adversary is still here, and for the exact same reason. That said, about 99.999999% of what is blamed on Satan has nothing to do with Satan, it's just us making bad choices.

To demonstrate just how serious God is about this choice, even when our planet is returned to the conditions depicted in the Garden, after a thousand years of joyous living, Satan will be allowed to once again spoil the party.

Freewill is not only a prerequisite for a loving relationship; choosing well must have its rewards. Likewise, choosing poorly cannot be without consequence. After 'Adam's and Chawah's disregard for Yahowah's *tsawah* | instructions, life would be different. God's guidance would have no credibility if He were free to ignore, cancel, or change it without consequence. As a result, Yahowah did not forgive them (at least not at this time).

This is bad news for those who have accepted Catholicism's and Christianity's, even Judaism's and Mormonism's copious and consistent negations and alterations of Yahowah's Instructions. Blaming Chawah is like saying that someone is responsible for our bad decisions. It infers that God is going to overlook our rewording and repudiation of His directions just because everyone else was doing it. Hey God, You can't be mad at me. The only other human here she gave it to me, and she ate. ... You can't be blaming me. You were the one that let this cotton-picking creature here come into the Garden. We were just going ...

Blaming Satan, which is to attribute our errant ways to religious, political, and/or academic deceptions, did not help Chawah. No. We have to be personally responsible and personally accountable. God has established a standard, and it's an easy standard to meet. It's even an open book test. He has communicated His rules, all of which are benefits for us. If you want to play baseball it's not a hit if the ball goes outside the fowl lines and if you're playing golf and you can't keep it on the property then I'm sorry, but there's a penalty.

God has established a standard, and if you follow His standard, you're better off. It is better to hit the ball in the fairway and to be in the short grass than it is hidden behind the trees. He has communicated His rules and His remedies and He's going to judge those who violate them rendering their social, religious, academic, and political schemes as moot. It is but one acceptable approach: answer His *Miqra'ey* / Invitations. All right, so this is the next statement.

“Yahowah (*Yahowah* – the proper pronunciation of YaHoWaH, our *'elowah* – God as directed in His *ToWRaH* – teaching regarding His *HaYaH* – existence and our *ShaLoWM* – restoration), **God** (*'elohym*), **said** (*'amar* – responded) **to** (*'el*) **the spellbinding serpent** (*wa ha nachash* – the sorcerous snake, this venomous viper, and poisonous cold-blooded reptile, this tempting and toxic creature; from *nachash* – the one who enchants and captivates regarding the Divine, the one who practices divination, magic, and sorcery, who indulges in prophecy to capitalize by fortunetelling, invoking supernatural knowledge and power), **‘As a consequence of** (*ky* – as a result of) **you having acted in this way** (*'asah zo'th* – of you having done this, having engaged in this manner

(qal perfect – this one time)), **you have brought a curse upon yourself** (*'arar 'atah* – you have invoked injury, misfortune, affliction, and harm, earning retribution for yourself),

You did this to yourself. You are responsible just like they are responsible.

more than any other (*min kol*) **beast** (*bahemah*), **more than any form of life** (*min ha chayah* – beyond all other conscious existence) **of this environment** (*ha sadeh* – the open environs outside the walled enclosure).

On (*'al*) **your belly** (*gachown 'atah* – the part of a reptile which makes contact with the hot coals of a fire) **you shall move about** (*halak* – travel, behave, and proceed (qal imperfect)),

That means that you are not going to soar with the eagles. You are not going to be able to spend an eternity being a free spirit. No. You are going to grovel like a reptile

you shall move about (*halak* – travel, behave, and proceed (qal imperfect)), **in the dirt** (*'apar* – the minute elements or particles which comprise matter)

'Apar is as far from the spiritual realm as one can be.

you shall eat (*'akal* – consume and devour (qal imperfect)) **all** (*kol*) **the days** (*yowmym*) **of your lives** (*chayym 'atah* – of your existence).” (*Bare'syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:14*)

You're going to consume the minute elements and particles that comprise matter. And indeed he has consumed a whole lot of (humans)?

Sometimes the words that Yahowah writes if you just think about them ...

For there to be justice there has to be recompense. So hard ... to be ... must be ...

For a judge to be moral, he must hold those who deceive, destroy, steal, and kill accountable. Satan used misrepresentations, errant citations, a straw man, an outright lie to project his failings into the mix and deceive Chawah, destroying her relationship with Yahowah, robbing her of her home, and misleading her soul. For that, Satan will be punished.

Satan's sentence, however, was not death. Spirits, unlike souls, are all immortal, even God cannot kill them. That is why the misfortune the Adversary brought upon himself is his retribution; recompense will be eternal anguish. Satan will be incarcerated for all but the last fleeting moments of the Sukah Millennial Sabbath. He will be released in the waning days and will use similar tactics to deprive some of those born during the thousand-year “right”, if you will, causing them to be wrong with God.

This will be the final rebellion and then Satan, his fellow demons, as well as all of those who have leagued with him, will be judged and found wanting. They will find themselves in an eternal prison called She'owl. Made especially for Satan and his colleagues, this penitentiary is indistinguishable from a black hole. It is a lightless place of emotional anguish separated from God. It is a place where the pressures are so intense, the minute particles which comprise matter are consumed. Ultimately... a one-dimensional construct where only time exists and everything else is consumed. Satan will have been largely responsible for everyone whose soul is consumed by this black hole.

There are three ways to interpret God’s message to the Adversary. The simplest would have been understood by the first person to hear the story. Satan acted badly and was punished. Groveling on one’s belly and eating dirt has never been good. That’s the simplest.

Spiritually, Satan was cast down and as a result his days are spent in the material realm devouring mankind. ‘Adam was created from the very substance that Satan was predicted to consume. ‘Adam was comprised from the dust of the earth, so Satan was condemned to devour the very stuff of humanity and he was precluded from the spiritual realm because there is no material physical dust in heaven. So, he was burdened by with that which he consumed, and it is that very matter that is sucked into that black hole and kept there. It devours it.

Scientifically, the leading astrophysicist of our day, Stephen Hawking, invested the last decade of his life advancing the theory which is suggested here – that matter can be consumed. He has postulated that this condition exists within the confines of black holes. While most scientists despise his conclusion, knowing that physics itself is based upon the conservation of matter, Hawking (who died in 2018) was inadvertently confirming what Yahowah has revealed. The first thing God said He will do following the Millennial Sabbath is to completely destroy the entire universe. But do not be alarmed. He will instantaneously create a new one, this time with us as witnesses in addition to being beneficiaries. Can you imagine how wonderful that's going to be?

The prophetic portrayal which follows, and we’ll go one step deeper into this since we are recording but not broadcasting. It says that the relationship between Satan and mankind, especially as it is manifest in the role of religion and politics having played in beguiling and suppressing the people throughout time. But it is especially poignant when seen from the perspective of the Chosen People. As we consider what God says next, think about how Satan’s religions: Christianity, Islam, and Socialist Secular Humanism, have all targeted Jews as their enemy. No population on earth has been treated with more rancor longer than God’s witnesses, and that's the common thread ... Christianity, Islam, and socialist secular humanism, they all target the Jews. By the way, all three were created by Jews as well. Hostility ... I've met the enemy and he is ____.

“Hostility and animosity (*wa ‘ebah* – enmity, an adversarial approach, a deep-seated dislike and rancor, bitterness and ill-will) **I will constitute and establish** (*shyth* – I will place and impose, set forth and appoint (qal perfect)) **between** (*bayn* – making the connections which lead to understanding by teaching those who closely examine and consider) **you** (*‘atah*) **and between** (*bayn* – over an interval of time, making a distinction through disassociation to apprehend this information and instruct) **the woman** (*ha ‘ishah* – the female) **and between** (*wa bayn* – to convey information which leads to understanding by making the proper connections and the comprehension of) **that which you sow** (*zera’ ‘atah* – your seed, that which propagates those like you, your offspring, that which you produce) **and her offspring** (*wa zera’ hy’* – her seed, that which she propagates and proliferates).

He shall crush (*huw’ shuwph* – he will press down upon and bruise, striking and crushing (qal imperfect)) **your head** (*‘atah ro’sh* – your brains and crucial sensory input, your source, beginning, leaders, government, perceptions and thought) **and you shall press down upon** (*wa ‘atah shuwph* – then you will batter, strike, crush and bruise) **his heel** (*huw’ ‘aqeb* – his stance, footsteps, and

movements, seeking to circumvent him by insidiously supplanting him).” (*Bare'syth* / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:15)

The thing that Satan has done is to create religions that strike at the heel. You might say what do you mean strike at the heel? Well, heel ... is Ya'aqob in Hebrew and the name Ya'aqob ... is based on heel and Ya'aqob is Yisra'el and Yisra'el are the Chosen people and they're the basis of the Covenant, the basis of all revelation, the basis of the Promised Land, the recipient of all of Yahowah's promises. Yisra'el. Every one of Yahowah's prophets is a descendant of Yisra'el, a descendant of Ya'aqob. So, the insight here is that you're going to bruise the heel. *He's going after Jews*. That's what he did and yet ... yet the way that man will strike back is at the head. So, the answer is to strike back at Satan you don't do what Chawah did. Don't say we're not like that, feels good, looks good, makes me feel good. No. Strike back in the most logical possible way. Compare what Satan inspires to what God inspires. Strike him on the head. Think your way through it. Use evidence and reason. Yahowah's Towrah and Prophets are trustworthy. They're reliable. They're valuable. They're useful. Take them and compare what God said to what the religious, the political, the conspiratorial, to what the militaristic are saying, what's being reported in Academia and the media. And if there is a conflict (and there always is) distrust those who are contradicting God.

KIRK: You can verify what Yah said. That's the beauty of this whole program.

YADA: Right. And we can do that in our heads so that we can attack Satan not in feelings, not in faith, not with fists, or as a jihadist but in our heads and our minds. Let's strike at the whole thought process of the whole thing. The deception is part of religion and politics, militarism and conspiracy. I think that's the message here. So, Kirk, I think you wanted to play off the term '*asher*' and we'll get to that next week.

I'm sorry, you didn't think we would do the whole review of the entire text... from the creation ...all the way through the man's rejection of God's testimony, but I thought sometimes that review is good because I know it's true for me that if I don't go through material a lot then consider it, talk about it, and apply it I have a tendency to forget it. And if somebody says that's counter to God, how do you know unless you remember what God said and how do you remember what God said unless we go over and over it again?

KIRK: This is so funny. I'm looking at 3:14 on the Masoretic text a NASA lexicon and it starts out the Lord God and then you to the right-hand column and it says Yahwah 'Elohym. How do they come up with the Lord?

YADA: How do you call it the inerrant word of God and yet change it? Talk about presumptuous. And then somebody says God doesn't care what you call Him. Well, then why did He write His name 7,000 times if He doesn't care? Why did He say when He introduced Himself to Moseh this is My one and only name and the way I want to be remembered for all time? Well, nobody knows how to pronounce it. Well, there's only three letters and all three are three of the most commonly written letters in the entire language. The first letter is pronounced exactly the way we pronounce a "Y" today. It makes the "Y" sound. It's a yowd. There have to be a thousand Hebrew words that have a yowd in them and are pronounced just like we pronounce a "Y" today. In English a

“Y” ___ as many languages that have a consonant-vowel. It is true in Hebrew. ... Right, and also a “W.”

God tells you how to pronounce the yowd and the hey. When He’s talking to Moses, He says I am who I am and *‘ehayah ‘asher ‘ehayah*. *Hayah* I exist *hayah-* y/yowd hey yah. Okay. So there's the first syllable. Yah, it's from from *hayah*. Is there anybody out there that says well, you know, we don't know how to pronounce *hayah*. ... Does anybody say we don't know how to pronounce Towrah? ... As for the wah ...the middle, what is the most common Hebrew term? Shalown. The “O” in Shalown doesn't come from a Hebrew “O”. Hebrew doesn't have a “O”. It’s wah that provides the “O” sound. Just like we have so many endless words ... Yeah. how now brown cow. The “O” now is a derivative of the “W”. Know, for example, the word. You ought to know better? Hey, it’s right there. And the only other letter is another hey | “ah.” Yahowah. ... So, there are 22 letters in the Hebrew alphabet, five of which are vowels and there's nobody to dispute how to pronounce Towrah and yet Towrah has a wah with the “o” sound and a hey for the “ah” sound. No one's disputing that. No one is disputing that shalown has an “O” sound in the middle of it - it’s from the wah. It’s not difficult stuff. El and ‘elohym is from ‘elowah. ...

KIRK: You have to become like Satan and just either ignore His name, spit on His name or change it.

YADA: And so why did they change His name? Because if you know God's name then you know Christianity is false. You can't pedal Christianity if you replace Yahowah’s name in His Towrah and Prophets because then there can be no Jesus or Christ or ... and there's no Lord.

How do you have a religion where man's word in the Talmud and the Mishnah rule supreme if God has a name and you can know Him personally? If the God who has a name says listen to Me, how in the world do you get people convinced that they should listen to rabbis instead? So this is a very serious point. When you said you're looking at any translation and they all say on the Lord God when this actually says Yahowah the Almighty.

KIRK: They even have it in parentheses over here to the right. I mean, it's like it's not like they don't know. It’s just awful.

YADA: Yeah, it is pathetic. So we'll pick the story up and Bare’syth 3:13 at this time next week, and it should be enjoyable. May Yah bless. Have a wonderful Shabat. Look forward to being with you next week. God bless. Good night.